

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended as set forth above in hopes of providing some clarifying terminology associated with the features. Claims 2, 4-7 and 9-24 are cancelled. Claims 25-42 are new. With regard to the cancelled claims, applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of any of the cancelled claims in any forth coming application(s). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Rejections of the Claims

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,035, 330 issued to Astiz et al. (hereinafter "Astiz"). Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Astiz. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify the language of the features of the claims. The independent claims indicate parsing a website to determine subordinate web pages of the web site. The independent claims indicate that one of the subordinate web pages is an interaction-required web page. The interaction-required web page ***requires user interaction to access a web page subordinate to the interaction-required web page***. An ***initial*** map is made of the web site. The ***initial*** map includes links to the web pages subordinate to the website including a link to the interaction required web page. However, the independent claims continue by indicating that the ***initial map does not include*** a link to the web page subordinate to the interaction-required web page. ***After the initial mapping is generated***, a selection of the link to interaction-required web page is received. The selection causes the display of the interaction-required web page in a user interface of the web-site diagramming application. The user interface of the web-site diagramming application displaying the interaction-required web page also includes an expand target selector. A user input is receiving in the displayed interaction-required web page to cause access to the web page subordinate to the interaction-required web page. In response to such access, (1) a determination is made as to whether the expand target selector is selected, (2) when the expand target selector is selected, the web page subordinate to the interaction-required web page and web pages subordinate to the web page subordinate to the

interaction-required web page are *caused to be additionally mapped to the initial map*, (3) when the expand target selector is not selected, *only* the web page subordinate to the interaction-required is *caused to be additionally mapped to the initial map*.

As indicated, the independent claims include features of the generation of the initial mapping, the generation of the display of the interaction-required website, the accesses to the website subordinate to the interaction-required website, and the additional mapping related to the access based on the expand selector. This combination of features is clearly not taught in Astiz. Applicants can simply find no teaching or suggestion of such features.

Astiz is teaching the problems associated with each user mapping the site. Astiz teaches the configuration of FIGURE 5 to remedy the problem of each user mapping the site. Aspects of the current specification allow the map making to take place on the user device so that the user is dynamically generating and dynamically viewing the map as the web site is being navigated. The current specification addresses the problems identified in Astiz with a different configuration. In the teachings of the current specification, the map making and modification takes place *on the current device and each user can generate their own map dynamically as they search.*

The specification includes the advantages of map making on the user computer *during the navigation process.* The user is able to dictate the scope of the map making dynamically to overcome the efficiency, bandwidth and consumption issues. In Astiz, if a new web site is encountered and does not have a map, again, the *new map* is generated. *The maps in Astiz are incrementally static.* Astiz teaches that “[i]f a map for this new web site is not stored in the map database 16, the user is preferably prompted to indicate whether he wants the *map maker 14* to create a map in real time for the website.” (Astiz, Col. 10, lines 54-58.). The map is of the entire website. There is no option in Astiz to add to an initial mapping based on access to a particular type of web page. Moreover, there is no teaching in Astiz of the Expand button as indicated in the claims. At Column 10, lines 1-14, Astiz teaches that:

Alternatively, one of the features of the present invention is exclusion of certain types of information including certain branches, certain types of files, redundant links, directories that should not be released to the general public, and certain links which require external viewers or might clutter up the map. *While these*

links may be included in the map data structure file, they may be selectively disabled for a less cluttered map unless the user requests display of the full map. (Astiz, Col. 10, lines 6-14, emphasis added.)

This teaching is not tied to the Expand button in FIGURE 6. Again, Astiz does not explain the Expand button as indicated in the claims. Astiz teaches that the links are still mapped...they just are not displayed to the user. Excessive mapping may cause bandwidth and efficiency problems with the mapping on the user device. Accordingly, applicants assert that the independent claims are allowable over the cited reference. Reconsideration is requested.

With regard to the dependent claims, they include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Furthermore, those claims ultimately depend from the independent claims above. As such, they should be found allowable for at least those same reasons.

II. Request for Reconsideration

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



RYAN T. GRACE
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 402.344.3000

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
612.332.5300

